



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 55 No. 09

8th March 2019

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|---|---|
| The Equality of Sexlessness By G.K. Chesterton | 1 |
| Basic Income through a National Dividend | 2 |
| Questioning Darwinism By Brian Simpson | 3 |
| Is the Earth Flat, or Just Shaped like a Chocolate Donut? I Ponder By Uncle Len | 4 |

THOUGHT OF THE WEEK: “It [feminism] is mixed up with a muddled idea that women are free when they serve their employers but slaves when they help their husbands.”

– G.K. Chesterton

THE EQUALITY OF SEXLESSNESS By G.K. Chesterton 1930

In almost all the modern opinions on women it is curious to observe how many lies have to be assumed before a case can be made. A young lady flies from England to Australia; another wins an air race; a Duchess creates a speed record in reaching India; others win motoring trophies; and now the King's prize for marksmanship has gone to a woman. All of which is very interesting and possibly praiseworthy as means of spending one's leisure; and if it were left at that, even if no more were added than the perfectly plain statement that such feats could not have been achieved by their mothers or their grandmothers, we would be content to doff our hats to the ladies with all the courtesy and respect which courage, endurance and ability have always rightly demanded.

But it is not left at that; and considerably more is added. It is suggested, for example, that the tasks were beyond the mothers and the grandmothers, not for the very obvious reason that they had no motorcars and airplanes in which to amuse their leisure hours, but because women were then enslaved by the convention of natural inferiority to man. Those days, we are told, “in which women were held to be incapable of positive social achievements are gone for ever.” It does not seem to have occurred to this critic that the very fact of being a mother and a grandmother indicates a certain positive social achievement; the achievement of which, indeed, probably left little leisure for travelling airily about the hemispheres. The same critic goes on to state, with all the solemn emphasis of profound thought, that “the important thing is not that women are the same as men – that is a fallacy – but that they are just as valuable to society as men. . . . Equality of citizenship means that there are twice as many heads to solve present-day problems as there were to solve the problems of the past. And two heads are better than one.” And the dreadful proof of the modern collapse of all that was meant by man and wife and the family council, is that this sort of imbecility can be taken seriously.

The *Times*, in a studied leading article, points out that the first emancipators of women (whoever they were) had no idea of what lay in store for future generations. “Could they have foreseen it they might have disarmed much opposition by pointing to the possibilities, not only of freedom, but of equality and fraternity also.” And we ask – what does it all mean? What in the name of all that is graceful and dignified does fraternity with women mean? What nonsense, or worse, is indicated by the freedom and the equality of the sexes? We mean something quite definite when we speak of a man being a little free with the ladies. What definite freedom is meant when the freedom of women is proposed? If it merely means the right to free opinions; the right to vote independently of husbands or fathers; what possible connection has it with the freedom to fly to Australia or score bulls-eyes at Bisley? If it really means, as we fear it does, freedom from the responsibility of managing a home and a family, an equal right with men in business and social careers, at the expense of home and family, then such progress we can only call a progressive deterioration.

And for men too, there is, according to a famous authoress, a hope of freedom. Men are beginning to revolt, we are told, against the old tribal custom of desiring fatherhood. The male is casting off the shackles of being a creator and a man. When all are sexless there will be equality. There will be no women and no men. There will be but a fraternity, free and equal. The only consoling thought is that it will endure but for one generation. ***

BASIC INCOME THROUGH A NATIONAL DIVIDEND

All dividends are a distribution of profits. Most modern Nations are profitable, although Nations don't now do *Profit and Loss Accounts*.

By way of example a Profit and Loss Account for the United States was done privately in Australia for the year 2014. Using US Federal Reserve economic data (FRED), US Bureau of Economic Assessment statistics, and some private research the profitability of the United States was affirmed.

It showed that while \$12.5 trillion of consumer goods were both produced and sold, the total aggregate income of all persons was only \$10.1 trillion. This sum of consumer production over and above the total incomes paid to induce it, amounted to \$2.4 trillion in total, and to \$7,500 per person, or to \$30,000 per American family of four.

The excess of consumer production over consumer incomes was financed by the United States' total indebtedness increasing in 2014 by \$2.3 trillion. Because America is profitable each year, it has to increase its debt each year to finance the consumption of that part of its consumer production which its incomes will not buy. Failing this, the Nation would go into recession and eventually into economic depression.

This debt was supplied by the Reserve Bank in association with Private Banks, creating new and additional money and distributing it as debt owing to themselves. This is a regular occurrence every year.

It might as easily have been supplied by a National Credit Authority with court-like powers, both calculating the National Dividend, and empowered to distribute it to all persons in equal measure and without discrimination. It would be distributed as a dividend, that is, debt free and without any interest or fees charged.

This finances a large measure of Basic Income without taxing anyone, or increasing the Nation's indebtedness.

All Banks would be restrained from funding consumption as debt, to the extent that it has now been funded by the National Dividend. No more money is being created here. The same amount as is normal would be created, though in a different way. This avoids double funding consumption and creating demand inflation, and being created without any need for repayment or interest, there is no cost-push inflation either.

The Banks would continue to finance production as they do now, and with minimal regulation.

Any inadequacy of the National Dividend would be

supplemented with social security funded by taxation in the normal way. While this appeals to most, it may displease some vested interests.

If a technical review of the National account mentioned above is desired, it may be viewed at <http://www.socialcredit.com.au/uploads/NationalAccountsPrototypes.pdf>

A 46 minute discussion of a National Dividend may be viewed at <https://youtu.be/H79b6ZgQv10>

Please forward this note on to your friends if you found it interesting. The mass media will not help until the battle for National Dividends is already won.

Empower yourself and others by spreading this message one to one via the internet. Please act.

We have nothing to lose but our ever increasing indebtedness.

Visit the website www.socialcredit.com.au for other relevant information. ***

Talk of a Basic Income for all, is gaining currency these days. It is plain to see that as technology replaces human labour there will be less people earning a wage. Imagine a decade or two along the track when there will be few people earning a wage!

Where will the community find sufficient money to purchase necessary goods and services? "Well they will get unemployment benefits", you say.

That is correct but it is the funding of such payments that needs attention. If you reckon the taxes will provide it; then look further. Fewer income earners mean fewer taxes gathered through wages. This will lead to attempts to collect more taxes from less people. It would not be long before the few remaining workers were so heavily taxed that they would cease working. That leaves the business world to suffer the growing taxes and it wouldn't be very long before they closed their doors under a heavy tax burden.

You will find this article interesting because it shows another way to provide a fair level of purchasing power in the community. We need a solution which balances the level of purchasing power with the prices of goods and services available.

As the article last line reads, "We have nothing to lose but our ever increasing level of indebtedness". We must seek an answer. - Ken Grundy

QUESTIONING DARWINISM By Brian Simpson

According to mainstream science, about 97 percent of biologists, life evolved from the primal slime, moving from single cell organisms to humans. It did this without the intervention of intelligence, no space people, or gods/God. The mechanism was, and is, random mutations, that are then subjected to natural selection. But selection by definition means that there has to be something to first select, so everything goes back to random mutations. Geneticists admit that most random mutations are deleterious, and thus bad, but there are low probability mutations that are beneficial, and these are selected.

What is supposed here is that there is some sort of pre-established harmony between environmental needs and these random mutations. Thus, moths in an industrial area, where there is pollution, would benefit from darker colours. Sure, natural selection would favour the darker moths of species X, but what if there were NO darker moths to start out with? How would a random mutation happily occur to produce just the needed colour change? Surely the chances of this are infinitesimal, since there is no mechanism linking the need of the species, with its genetic; it is all random after all.

These sorts of concerns are just the tip of the sceptical iceberg:

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/a-simpler-origin-for-life/>

‘Over 1,000 scientists have now joined the growing movement to challenge prevailing evolutionary theory. Under present scientific dictatorship, theories like Darwinism go virtually undisputed; challenging such a widely accepted belief is almost certainly career suicide. But as the “dissent from Darwin” movement

shows, even the most “established” of theories should still be subject to scrutiny. To continue to blindly accept a theory, even with evidence to the contrary, is more akin to brain-washing. The true spirit of science, after all, is to question — not to follow. The aptly-named list, “A Scientific Dissent from Darwinism,” surpassed 1,000 names in early 2019. Respected professionals from around the country who’ve earned doctorate degrees from top-tier universities are joining forces to remind the establishment, and the public, that what scientists know, and what they think they know are two different things. The *Dissent from Darwin* list was created in 2001 and is maintained by the Discovery Institute. All 1,043 dissenters have signed the same 32-word statement, which reads:

“We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged.” This is what radicalism looks like in 2019, and in case you can’t tell — it’s also what “common sense” used to look like. The very idea that questioning Darwinism could be so controversial is laughable; if no one ever questioned “prevailing theory,” we’d all still believe the Earth was flat. There would be no Darwinism either, for that matter. And yet, here we are: Living in a world where asking too many questions is considered dangerous.’

Truth today, does not matter to science; what counts is profit, and delivering politically correct justifications for the existing anarcho-tyrannical regime. ***

WHY AUSTRALIANS ARE NOT GOING TO OWN THEIR HOMES By James Reed

This is what happens when the sheeple just let things go. There has been plenty of opportunity to oppose the buy ups in the past, but as with immigration, it is just let go, out of apathy, self-consumption and sheepish incomprehension:

“The country is at risk of becoming the “24th province of China” as we fail to “stem the tide” of foreign investors, an expert has warned. Australia is selling off natural resources, farmland and property to China at a “crazy” rate — putting us at risk of becoming the “24th province” of the East Asian behemoth. That’s according to real estate expert Doug Driscoll, who warned of the urgent need to start a national conversation about foreign ownership of residential property in particular. While interest from overseas buyers has decreased in recent years, the Starr Partners chief executive said our overall rate of foreign ownership was still alarmingly high. And he said a report released last month by Chinese international property portal Juwai.com showed there was now an

“insatiable appetite” for Australian property among Chinese buyers, with our softening housing market boosting interest. In 2017, ANZ found foreign buyers owned up to 400,000 Australian homes. Today, Mr Driscoll estimated that figure would be “close to 500,000”. ANZ also estimated foreign investors bought between 30,000 and 50,000 new dwellings in 2015-16. At that rate, Mr Driscoll said it “won’t be too long” before a million homes were in foreign hands, with buyers from China and India the most common demographic. “It doesn’t take a rocket scientist to wonder what impact that could have on our economy,” he said. “We’re only a population of 25 million with 10 million dwellings, and if we’re not careful we could be overrun quite easily.”

Watching this all unfold over many decades, I predict that the economic overrun point will occur very soon, probably in a few years, if it has not already occurred. Arguably, Australia has lost its political autonomy long ago. ***

IS THE EARTH FLAT, OR JUST SHAPED LIKE A CHOCOLATE DONUT?

I PONDER By Uncle Len, Amateur Cosmologist

Fighting depression, heart disease, diabetes, syndrome X, Y and Z, as well as many pathologies unknown to modern science, I am back with a bright, fresh and shining article about the flat Earth theory. Well, no, not really. Just about the freedom to expound on controversial things. Once, it was not controversial to believe, and say that the Earth was flat. Now, although it is not yet illegal, Big Tech is clamping down on it, having put the big stomping boots onto race/gender/immigration issues, that maybe 50 years ago, would have been uncontroversial. It is all about power and who runs the great cesspool of society.

Anyway, Mike Adams is not going to censor flat Earth videos, and that makes my day:

<https://www.naturalnews.com/2019-02-23-the-earth-is-a-sphere-but-flat-earth-videos-brighteon-minority-views-speech.html>

“With YouTube recently announcing it’s going to explicitly down-rank Flat Earth videos (and other topics, such as 9/11 analysis videos), I’m affirming today that even though I am convinced the Earth is a sphere, Flat Earth theory videos are welcomed on Brighteon.com because minority views deserve a platform for speech (even if those views are incredibly unpopular or seem bizarre). This is important to note, because even though I am convinced the Earth is a sphere, I also believe that dissenting views on science, astronomy, medicine, history, psychology, religion and everything else deserve a platform for speech. In other

words, I agree with the free speech rights of those with whom I disagree... with certain narrow limits described below. Brighteon.com is not a platform for Satanism, for example. Since Satanism videos are welcomed on YouTube and all the left-wing tech giants which are actually run by Satanists, there is no organized censorship of Satanism videos. Satanists don’t need an independent platform for free speech, since they already run Hollywood, public schools, the tech giants and much of the left-wing media. In contrast, Brighteon is a platform for those whose views are systematically censored... including those who discuss minority views on science, medicine, history, consciousness, religion or practically any other topic. With YouTube now censoring videos about the Flat Earth theory, Brighteon.com become the obvious platform to host those videos without interference; with no down-ranking, no search suppression and no shadowbanning.”

If the flat Earth, and the alternative Uncle Len chocolate donut theories are so silly, then why is Zucky, or whoever, lying awake at night thinking up new ways of censoring us? Mark my words, your mentally unhinged friendly neighbourhood lunatic Uncle Len, could be the next Galileo (1564-1642), to be burn at the stake for his beliefs, only Galileo wasn’t, it was Giordano Bruno (1548 -1600), thanks to the magic of Wiki, which makes even fools look semi-educated. ***

THE GREAT GLOBAL WARMING SCANDAL By James Reed

Well, looky see, those objective climate scientist are doing all sorts of weird and less-than-wonderful things to the basic data, and bingo, global warming and climatic catastrophe. Just like magic:

<https://www.powerlineblog.com/archives/2019/02/the-greatest-scandal-in-the-history-of-science.php>

“More warming adjustments from ACORN2

Once again we find that the oldest thermometers were apparently reading artificially high even though many were newish in 1910 and placed in approved Stevenson screens.) This is also despite the additional urban warming effect of a population that grew 400% since then. What are the odds?!

Fortunately, gifted , (sorry) scientists have uncovered the true readings from the old biased thermometers which they explain carefully in a 67 page impenetrable document.

Chris Gillham has soldiered through the new

TASMANIAN TOUR

Arnis Luks will be touring

Tasmanian households from

6th to 13th April inclusive.

Please ensure you do not miss out on his interactive forum of

“The Manipulation of News and Opinion and How to Counter it”.

To join a local forum

contact Rod Linger

- evenings after 6pm ONLY -

Ph 03 6367 8173

“ACORN 2” adjustments that the Australian Bureau of Meteorology has o-so-quietly released and Australians are just waking up to find that our coldest mornings back in 1910 were even colder than anyone realized

at the time. Graham Lloyd is reporting in *The Australian* how the second rewrite in six years increases the warming by 23% . (Where was the ABC announcement?) The ACORN series of the Bureau of Meteorology includes 112 stations. Their report lists the warming trends per decade in Table 9. I converted that into the total warming since 1910 and graphed that below. About one third of the warming of our mean temperature is due to man-made adjustments Comparing AWAP (semi-raw) to the latest ACORN2, the mean temp is up

from 0.08C up to 0.123C per decade. That’s a 50% increase.

To slow Australia’s warming it’d be much cheaper to replace the BOM rather than our electricity grid.

Just a thought. ***